

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

CHARMEEN D. WASHINGTON,  
Plaintiff,  
-against-  
NABIA CHONG; DANIELLE IACONO,  
Defendants.

23-CV-1936 (LTS)

ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR  
PRO BONO COUNSEL

LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN, Chief United States District Judge:

Plaintiff has filed an Application for the Court to Request Counsel. For the following reasons, Plaintiff's application is denied.

**LEGAL STANDARD**

The *in forma pauperis* statute provides that the courts "may request an attorney to represent any person unable to afford counsel." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Unlike in criminal cases, in civil cases, there is no requirement that courts supply indigent litigants with counsel. *Hodge v. Police Officers*, 802 F.2d 58, 60 (2d Cir. 1986). Instead, the courts have "broad discretion" when deciding whether to grant an indigent litigant's request for *pro bono* representation. *Id.* Even if a court does believe that a litigant should have a free lawyer, under the *in forma pauperis* statute, a court has no authority to "appoint" counsel, but instead, may only "request" that an attorney volunteer to represent a litigant. *Mallard v. U.S. Dist. Court for the S. Dist. of Iowa*, 490 U.S. 296, 301–310 (1989). Moreover, courts do not have funds to pay counsel in civil matters. Courts must therefore grant applications for *pro bono* counsel sparingly, and with reference to public benefit, in order to preserve the "precious commodity" of volunteer-lawyer time for those litigants whose causes are truly deserving. *Cooper v. A. Sargent Co., Inc.*, 877 F.2d 170, 172-73 (2d Cir. 1989).

In *Hodge*, the Second Circuit set forth the factors a court should consider in deciding whether to grant an indigent litigant's request for *pro bono* counsel. 802 F.2d at 61-62. Of course, the litigant must first demonstrate that he or she is indigent, for example, by successfully applying for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The court must then consider whether the litigant's claim "seems likely to be of substance" – "a requirement that must be taken seriously." *Id.* at 60–61. If these threshold requirements are met, the court must next consider such factors as:

the indigent's ability to investigate the crucial facts, whether conflicting evidence implicating the need for cross-examination will be the major proof presented to the fact finder, the indigent's ability to present the case, the complexity of the legal issues[,] and any special reason in that case why appointment of counsel would be more likely to lead to a just determination.

*Id.*; see also *Cooper*, 877 F.2d at 172 (listing factors courts should consider, including litigant's efforts to obtain counsel). In considering these factors, district courts should neither apply bright-line rules nor automatically deny the request for counsel until the application has survived a dispositive motion. See *Hendricks v. Coughlin*, 114 F.3d 390, 392-93 (2d Cir. 1997). Rather, each application must be decided on its own facts. See *Hodge*, 802 F.2d at 61.

## DISCUSSION

The Court granted Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF 3), and Plaintiff therefore qualifies as indigent.

Plaintiff's original complaint failed to state a claim, and she has not yet filed an amended complaint. The Court is therefore unable to determine whether Plaintiff brings any claim "likely to be of substance," *Hodge*, 802 F.2d 61-62, or whether granting the request for "counsel would be more likely to lead to a just determination," *id.* at 60. Plaintiff's request for counsel is therefore denied without prejudice to renewal.

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's application for *pro bono* counsel (ECF 5) is denied without prejudice to Plaintiff's renewed application after she files an amended complaint.

The Court certifies under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 5, 2023  
New York, New York

/s/ Laura Taylor Swain

---

LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN  
Chief United States District Judge